UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

.____X Civil Docket# SCHWAB, et al., Plaintiff : 04 - cv - 1945

- versus - : U.S. Courthouse Brooklyn, New York

PHILIP MORRIS, USA INC., et al.,

Defendant: April 19, 2005 ____X

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN M. GOLD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Douglas McNamara, Esq. For the Plaintiff:

Paul Gallagher, Esq.

For the Defendant: Murray Garnick, Esq.

Official Transcriber: Rosalie Lombardi

L.F.

Transcription Plus II Transcription Service:

823 Whittier Avenue

New Hyde Park, N.Y. 11040

(516) 358-7352

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

Proceedings

there is a couple of things that I think are undisputed.

The first point is that Philip Morris not relying on the study and no defense expert is relying on the study.

number one. You say that no defense expert is relying on the study. I was interested to read in one of the decisions that one of the parties cite, I wish I could tell you I remembered which one it was but I can't, the Court notes that the expert having recently participated in this study which is so germane to the facts in dispute in the case, will necessarily have his or her opinions influenced and affected by his immersion in the details of the study, even if he does not explicitly rely upon it.

One of the things that I haven't heard you say and I don't know if it's because it's not true or because you just haven't thought to say it is whether the experts you will be calling at trial have had access to and participated in the use of the data that you're seeking to protect from disclosure.

MR. GARNICK: Well --

Proceedings

THE COURT: In other words, are the experts who are working on the study, do they overlap with the experts you intend to call at trial?

MR. GARNICK: For the outside experts, the answer is clear. None of the outside experts had any involvement in the study. They don't have access to the data and they have just no knowledge of the study other than what -- to the extent we give them the papers that were filed before this court.

Obviously, to the extent that Philip Morris' internal scientists are called to testify, some of them have been involved in the study. However, they're not going to be relying on the study. And the reason they're not going to be relying on the study goes to my second point and that is it is an ongoing study and the statistical analysis of the study has barely begun. There is nothing to rely on. They're not going to rely on the results. They don't have results. They don't have results. They don't have statistical analysis.

What the issue here, after all, is not trying to get Philip Morris' statistical

Proceedings

There is little utility in the study for a number of reasons. First, as I say, we're not relying on the study. No one will be relying on the study. Plaintiffs have not cited a single case like this where no one is relying on the study that's not incorporated in anyone's analysis.

Second, this is a fraud case. And ongoing study whose statistical analysis has not been completed is not going to be relevant to any so-called secret information that Philip Morris might have had or any fraudulent intent. It's not relevant to fraud.

Next, Philip Morris is not trying to be over inclusive in its objections. It's turning over all the documents. It's already turned over over 20,000 pages of documents. It's continuing to turn over documents. It's going to turn over the pilot study. It's going to turn over the data for the pilot study.

It is rifle-shotting (sic) the database because it's an ongoing process --

THE COURT: I don't understand the use of the phrase rifle-shotting. I'm sorry. What do you mean by rifle-shotting?